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Introduction

The concept of a ‘learner identity’ has been approached from a variety of different theories and methodological approaches. Scholarship on learner identities primarily speaks to various socio-psychological concepts such as ‘meta-cognition,’ ‘self-concept,’ ‘self-regulation’ and ‘practice.’ However, from a sociological perspective, the learner is conceptualized as both agentic and able to have control over their own decisions, but also as highly relational and embedded within the social milieu. The learner is significantly influenced both by the context of education systems and the individuals within them (Reay, 2010). We focus on what habitus lends to expanding our understandings of learner identities. Explorations of habitus began as early as Aristotle and was furthered by both Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Edmund Husserl as a theory of action, where social agents are not passive, “pulled and pushed about by external forces, but skillful creatures who actively construct social reality” (Wacquant, 2011, p. 85). Drawing specifically upon Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of habitus we posit some aspects scholars should consider when attempting to use habitus to theorize learner identities.

During his time in Algeria, where he performed his national service, Bourdieu developed an interest in habitus (c.f. Calhoun, 2006; Schultheis & Frisinghelli, 2012) as a way of thinking about how our lives are constrained by both socio-economic positioning and social structures. This interest runs throughout his extensive work. As with most sociological approaches, to understand Bourdieu’s work it is necessary to examine how agency and power are positioned. The structures, according to Bourdieu, are a constraining framework in which meaning is derived by a social agent. Furthermore, Bourdieu argues that structural disadvantages are internalized (through socialization) and produce forms of behaviour. Therefore, Bourdieu cannot be located on either side of the agency/structure divide (Grenfell, 2008) and, through playing both sides, Bourdieu’s tools address the tensions between the two, perhaps making his research a stronger articulation of the human experience.

According to Bourdieu, habitus, as a tool, can be useful in providing insight into how we are socialized from birth to both understand and participate in
the world and how our experiences are unequal. Today, we see habitus – like other terms in Bourdieu’s oeuvre (e.g. cultural capital, social capital) – mentioned in major UK and Australian news press like The Guardian, although it is not always clearly defined. Bourdieu (1998) describes habitus as embodied – “a body which has incorporated the immanent structures of a world or of a particular sector of that world – a field – and which structures the perception of that world as well as action in the world” (p. 81). Habitux, as a major part of Bourdieu’s theoretical framework, exists in relation to his other tools, specifically field and capital. The ways that we access and move through and exist within various and particular social spaces (e.g. fields) depends on our accumulations of ‘capital’ – what Bourdieu describes as authoritative recognition of capital within these fields. For example, a professor may have spent substantial time in higher education and hold multiple degrees which are recognized as capital within the ‘field’ of a university. The professor can speak about his area of expertise confidently and using particular words and those around him will recognize that he has symbolic power within that field. However, when he goes to the mechanic to pick up his car, he has entered a new field where his degrees, skills and knowledge are likely not recognized. Similarly, the mechanic, who holds a similar authority and expertise in his workplace may feel out of place in a university where what ‘counts’ as capital is different.

This chapter examines the way that critical theoretical educational research has operationalized habitus – in conjunction with capitals and field – to examine how learner identities are formed in formal education settings. In considering the role of the ‘learner’ we may expect to see equal attention to pedagogic styles and enactments. However, despite Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) calling attention to what they call pedagogic actions (PA), for the most part Bourdieu sees pedagogy as “the imposition and inculcation of a cultural arbitrary by an arbitrary mode of imposition and inculcation (education)” (pp. 5–6). Bourdieu argues that forms of schooling are where the student – while agentic – is directly and indirectly imparted with patterns of thinking. Specifically, we focus on how habitus captures the internalization of class and how it mediates relationally to various other fields (Stahl, 2015a, 2015b; Reay, 2004). Habitus, in this sense, highlights the importance of thinking about how individuals are conditioned by not only their social backgrounds but their primary socialization. This primary socialization informs one’s formal schooling experiences contributing to the structuring of an individual’s life chances (Li, 2015). We are interested in how habitus addresses how learner identities are configured in relation to social class, which then – through the process of primary and secondary socialization – contribute to the formation and maintenance of those identities. With this in mind, the conceptual tool of habitus represents an attempt to extend understandings around internalized behaviours, perceptions, and beliefs that individuals carry with them and which, in part, are translated into the practices they draw on as they transfer to and from the fields in which
they interact. Habitus, therefore, is not static but “permeable and responsive” (Reay, 2004, p. 434), and the dispositions formed in the habitus become layered through [in]congruous experiences.

While habitus has been critiqued for being too deterministic (Jenkins, 1992; Levinson & Holland, 1996), we place this criticism off to the side. Instead we focus on educational research where habitus has been found to offer rich explanatory potential in understanding how schools socialize students to see themselves as certain types of learners and where they come to embody a certain type of learner identity validated by the institution. Given how Bourdieu worked to break down what he perceived as the false divides between theory and method, we focus on the ways in which habitus is what is being studied while also an essential tool structuring the analysis (Reay, 2004). It is important to note here that the chapter purposely adopts the language of ‘learner identity’ – as opposed to ‘student habitus’ which is more common (c.f. McKinnon, 2016; Azizova & Perez Mendez, 2019) – and we focus on learner identities in formal educational institutions as opposed to the home (Noble, 2017). Working across Bourdieu’s scholarship, as well as scholarship inspired by Bourdieu, our interest is in what theory lends to research and vice versa.

**An overview of habitus**

Bourdieu’s tools are designed to theorize human action as a dialectical relationship between objective structures and subjective agency. This section provides a brief overview of how Bourdieu conceived of habitus and how he used it to explore and critique social structures. Bourdieu refused to conceive of individuals and structures as binary oppositions and saw individuals and conditions within society as intertwined (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 19). Habitus, in Bourdieu’s words (1977), is:

> the strategy generating principle enabling agents to cope with unforeseen and ever-changing situations . . . a system of lasting and transposable dispositions which integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks.

(p. 72)

To speak of habitus is to argue that individuals, as both physical bodies and subjective identities, are structured by their experiences with the wider social world (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Therefore, our dispositions, habits and perceptions, both internally and embodied, are created by our existence within the social and physical world. Bourdieu’s theory of practice intends to show how relations of privilege and domination are produced through the interaction of habitus, capital (e.g. economic, cultural, social and symbolic) and field.
With this in mind, Bourdieu (1997) calls attention to the habitus as having a 'practical sense' where:

what enables one to act as one ‘should’ (dei, as Aristotle put it) without positing or executing a Kantian ‘should’, a rule of conduct. The dispositions that [habitus] actualizes – ways of being that result from a durable modification of the body through its upbringing – remain unnoticed until they appear in action, and even then, because of the self-evidence of their necessity and their immediate adaptation to the situation.

(p. 139)

Of course, this ‘practical sense’ is shaped by the individual in relation to their experiences. Drawing on educational research, Lareau (2003) writes about how habitus is differentiated amongst individuals, so that there is variation amongst people in terms of their skills, knowledge, social networks such as friends, family and acquaintances, and the material such as money and possessions. As we move through the world, our capital(s) may be recognized and valued depending on the logic of the fields we encounter which, in turn, affects our social status and reputation. “He writes that the structure of strategies depends on: (1) ‘their position in the field’ (the volume and composition of capital); (2) ‘the perception that they have of the field’ (habitus); and (3) ‘the state of the instruments of reproduction’ (field)” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 101; Bourdieu, 1984, p. 125; Yang, 2014, p. 1528). Therefore, the habitus – as an internalization of external structures – requires the researcher to consider how it reacts to the solicitations of the field. Thus, using habitus as a method for critical theoretical research requires careful thinking about how individuals are engaged in a process of social learning where – over time – there is an element of mastery. Linking back to our previous example, through the process of social learning it is conceivable the mechanic can come to master the logic of the university just as the professor can become a skilled mechanic. The habitus is, after all, malleable – but this raises questions as to the adaptability of the habitus as pre-existing dispositions remain a powerful structuring force.

Habitus, as a theory, highlights how “not only is the body in the social world, but also the ways in which the social world is in the body” (Reay, 2004, p. 432). Therefore, the concept of habitus calls the researcher’s attention not only to how identity is formed in social processes and maintained, modified or even reshaped by and through social relations as well as the ethos of the institutions (past, present and future) but also to the way that institutions and structures can be modified by the internalized forces of habitus. Thinking about identity in terms of both individuals and structures is important because it highlights how individuals contribute to social reproduction and how certain discourses (e.g. meritocracy, neoliberalism, humanism) become internalized. Habitus functions as an internal and individually distinctive catalogue of social experiences and movement within the social world (Costa & Murphy, 2015). For example, Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) contend that working-class
students do not aspire highly because, through their habitus, they have internalized and reconciled themselves to the idea that, because of a lack of social, cultural and economic capital, their opportunities are limited (Swartz, 1997). Or as Bourdieu (1992) asserts, “People are not fools; they are much less bizarre or deluded than we would spontaneously believe precisely because they have internalized, through a protracted and multisided process of conditioning, the objective chances they face” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 130). This brings us to an aspect of habitus Bourdieu calls attention to but is frequently forgotten, especially by critics who consider habitus as too deterministic. Specifically, how habitus engages in “strategic calculation of costs and benefits, which tends to carry out at a conscious level the operations that habitus carries out in its own way” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 131).

Researchers contend that habitus is at once the “anchor, the compass, and the course of ethnographic journey” (Wacquant, 2011, p. 81) while functioning as a ‘conceptual linchpin’ that can translate concepts with highly economic connotations into non-economic paradigms (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Whilst habitus may indeed provide a valuable compass, it remains an abstract, contradictory and contested sociological concept that took many shapes even in Bourdieu’s own writing (Reay, 2004) and remains notably difficult to operationalize in sociological research (Sullivan, 2002). This has lent to different approaches in the operationalization of habitus where there is an ‘art to its application’ (Murphy & Costa, 2015) and significant debates (Stahl, Perkins, & Burnard, 2017).

**Habitus and the study of learner identities**

In his work on learner identities, Bourdieu established early on how students from families with higher degrees of cultural capital not only had higher rates of academic success, but also exhibited different modes and patterns of cultural consumption and expression. Analyzing the role of schooling, Bourdieu “emphasizes that schools teach students *particular* things and socializes them in *particular* ways” (Grenfell, 2008, p. 188, italics in the original). For example, in terms of the corporeality, Bourdieu noted a tendency for teachers in mid-twentieth-century France to demand their students maintain a particular mouth shape. Such practices often “directly helped to devalue popular modes of expression, dismissing them as ‘slang’ and ‘gibberish’ . . . and to impose recognition of the legitimate language” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 49). Work inspired by Bourdieu highlights how most forms of formal schooling privilege not only certain aspects of selfhood but also certain behaviours and decorum (Ayling, 2019; Watkins & Noble, 2013).

As a theoretical tool, habitus has implications when one considers education as a powerful form of inculcation – promoting certain values and knowledges – where educators often engage in socializing students to norms and behaviour, or in internalizing certain dispositions, within the habitus of the learner. For example, Lareau and Weininger (2003) draw attention to how cultural capital
is institutionalized in the form of high-status cultural signals (attitudes, preferences, formal knowledge, behaviours and credentials) which then contribute to social and cultural exclusion contending:

... cultural capital in school settings must identify the particular expectations – both formal and, especially, informal – by means of which school personnel appraise students. Secondly, as a result of their location in the stratification system, students and their parents enter the educational system with dispositional skills and knowledge that differentially facilitate or impede their ability to conform to institutionalized expectations.

( Lareau & Weininger, 2003, p. 488)

So, not only do school systems actively foster the habitus of students, but some students are more primed for particular capitals to be fostered as schools “serve as the trading post where socially valued cultural capital is parlayed into superior academic performance” (MacLeod, 2009, p. 14). However, with this in mind, it is important to note that while inculcation does occur to varying extents it is never fully realized, as education is always a secondary form of socialization.

An integral aspect of Bourdieu’s approach to habitus is the cognitive construction – or cognitive structures – highlighting the co-construction which occurs between field and habitus. Cognitive structures, shaped through the “spatial and temporal organization of social life,” serve as an orientation where the state finds ways to regulate practices and, by implication, dispositions within the habitus where “cognitive ‘categories,’ . . . are thus reified and naturalized” (Bourdieu, 1997, pp. 174–175). There exists a dialectical relationship between habitus and field where Bourdieu notes, “on one side, it is a relation of conditioning: the field structures the habitus. On the other side, it is a relation of knowledge or cognitive construction” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 127, original emphasis). This is important because the school – while powerful and potent – remains a secondary form of socialization. In studying the lives of young children, Connolly, Kelly, and Smith (2009), have highlighted how cultural dispositions, which are taken for granted and fostered in children within their respective communities prior to schooling, can then underpin the way that particular dispositions within school are developed and justified.

Applications: using habitus to theorize learner identities

While there is no clear roadmap to apply habitus in the study of learner identities, many have capitalized on Bourdieu’s body of work to extend knowledge of how learner identities are formed and maintained through institutions (c.f. Stahl, 2015b; Li, 2015; Colley, James, Diment, & Tedder, 2007). Costa and Murphy (2015, p. 9) write: “Applying habitus as a methodological tool means devising mechanisms through which social agents’ dispositional schemes can be identified within the fields in which they originate or transform.” Habitus, as a research tool, cannot be studied in isolation and is intended to be used relationally with a careful consideration to how capital and field contribute to the
actions of individuals as social agents. Foregrounding this relational approach to habitus to study learner identities is a conceptual break from the field of psychology or social psychology. With this in mind, we focus our attention on how habitus has been used by researchers to explore learner identities. We briefly outline three important aspects for scholars to consider when attempting to use habitus to theorize learner identities: the institutional ideal as structuring, corporeality and the hexis and the collective and classed nature.

**The institutional ideal as structuring**

For Bourdieu, pedagogy is nearly always authoritative and tied to symbolic violence (c.f. Noble, 2017) where students are often required in obvert and subtle ways to orientate themselves to idealized ways of being in line with the demands of formal schooling. This ideal contributes to the structuring of the habitus where learners are engaged in an internal deliberation around aspiring to an ideal that may never be achievable. The habitus is thus ‘orchestrated’ (Bourdieu, 1997, p. 146) in reference to the dominant discourse of the field and is worked upon as it seeks to accrue value (c.f. Skeggs, 2004). Frykholm and Nitzler (1993) write:

> Students with different habitus and notions are, through linguistic market forces, subjected to sanctions and structural influence towards mental homogenization. This structural influence also applies to the teacher who, to a certain extent, is ‘forced’ to adjust his or her teaching to the dominating structures of thought.

(p. 442)

Stahl (2015a) draws attention to how habitus is a constant evolving negotiation, simultaneously resisting and accepting the discourses it comes into contact with as a process of negotiation. As students move through their schooling and experience different pedagogic processes – experiences which become layered, contributing to the formation of their dispositions – this influences their internal deliberation and how they may act.

As students come to aspire to the institutional ideal, Colley et al. (2007) notes a tension between the ‘idealised habitus’ and the ‘realised habitus’ where they call attention to the “tempering effects of the realised habitus [where] students might be overwhelmed by the emotional demands of the work” (p. 489). Through a fragmented process of inculcation of values, attitudes and manners, the habitus of the students is formed in relation to the field (e.g. the institutional ideal). In experiencing this secondary form of socialization, such logics may sit (un)comfortably with the primary habitus (MacLeod, 2009; McKinnon, 2016).

Habitus, in this instance, as an effort to break down the agency/structure divide, allows for a deeper consideration of not only the formation of identity in relation to the social world but the tension between the ideal and the reality.
Corporeality and the hexis

Habitus is composed of a set of dispositions inculcated in the familial environment; these dispositions become embodied in the corporeal, through immersion in repetitive social practices and relations. This is what Bourdieu and Passeron (1977, p. 82) call the ‘bodily hexis.’ In Masculine Domination, Bourdieu (2001) writes:

Bodily hexis, which includes both the strictly physical shape of the body (‘physique’) and the way it is ‘carried’, deportment, bearing, is assumed to express the ‘deep being’, the true ‘nature’ of the ‘person’, in accordance with the postulate of the correspondence between the ‘physical’ and the ‘moral’ which gives rise to the practical or rationalized knowledge whereby ‘psychological’ and ‘moral’ properties are associated with bodily or physiognomic indices (e.g. a thin, sleek body tends to be perceived as the sign of a manly control of bodily appetites).

(p. 64)

We see here Bourdieu’s attention to bridging one’s attention to the body and the pre-reflexive consciousness. For Bourdieu (1997), hexis is the “durably modified body” which is “engendered and perpetuated, while constantly changing (within limits), in a twofold relationship, structured and structuring, to the environment” (p. 144).

Watkins and Noble’s (2013) research into students of Chinese, Pasifika and Anglo backgrounds and the home/school congruence in Australia explores how certain attributes become “embodied as dispositions towards learning” which they call ‘scholarly habitus’ (p. 1). This documents how the body comes to possess particular skills which are valued as cultural capital, highlighting the importance of skills such as ‘productive stillness’ which enables students to engage in particular types of learning. In determining how the learning is accessed, they note: “Composure, or the readiness to work, is fostered by the capacities for stillness, quiet and self-restraint which also underlay the ability to give sustained attention to classroom events and to concentrate on tasks” (Watkins & Noble, 2013, p. 57). This productive stillness, as a disposition, positively contributes to the student’s academic achievement though, as Bourdieu (2002) notes, “Dispositions are long-lasting: they tend to perpetuate, to reproduce themselves, but they are not eternal. They may be changed by historical action oriented by intention and consciousness and using pedagogic devices” (p. 29).

Habitus, in this instance, allows for a consideration of how learning experiences become deeply ingrained on the body of the learner which, in turn, becomes valued in certain ways as agents moves through their formal schooling and beyond the classroom.

The collective and classed nature

Bourdieu (1990) brings attention to how habitus, in terms of individual subjects, is “not the instantaneous ego of a sort of singular cogito, but the
individual trace of an entire collective history” (p. 91). Reay (2004) highlights how Bourdieu “views the dispositions, which make up habitus, as the products of opportunities and constraints framing individuals’ earlier life experiences” (p. 433). In this way, habitus takes on particular classed dispositions which may figure out in different ways across diverse and contrasting educational fields.

Researching elite spaces, Kenway and Koh (2013) draw on Bourdieu’s State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power (1989/1996) to show how class, culture and education are used as specific tools of logic, sanction and domination within Singapore’s education system. Kenway and Koh (2013) write how the state nobility of Singapore is “formed in significant part through elite education rather than through direct reproduction via economic wealth or family power” (pp. 273–274). Their work highlights how education is central to the creation or reproduction of the state nobility through the building and maintaining of the elite ruling classes. In particular, streaming, which begins in primary school, fosters learner identities which draw on hyper-competitiveness and intense cultural cultivation, so that schools increasingly become “racially and socially stratified” (p. 279). These elite schools in Singapore have emerged as a result of streaming practices, with a discourse of meritocracy underwriting “the view that those who govern are the best qualified to govern due to their ‘educational and professional qualifications and commercial success’” (pp. 279–280). Koh (2010) refers to this as ‘Singapore habitus’ which he describes as “deeply loyal and rooted in Singapore; hard-working and obedient for the national good” (p. 280). Within these elite schools, celebratory discourses, in terms of important alumni and school achievement, foster learner identities of meritocracy and deservedness which draw on what Kenway and Koh refer to as ‘character capital,’ made up of ethical dispositions and transnationality. Therefore, in considering how social conditions influence the habitus, forms of elite schooling inculcate the learner identity toward a sense of entitlement.

Turning our attention to the learner identities of the working classes, it is important to note that during Bourdieu’s career he was witness to the onset of mass schooling in France which brought about a new axis of judgement and pathologization of working-class children. Grenfell (2008) writes how working-class “[c]hildren were to blame for poor performance through lack of talent, and their parents were to blame for not providing the appropriate background – that is, the appropriate cultural capital – to succeed in school” highlighting the “lack of fit between lower- and working-class habitus and educational field” (p. 189, italics in the original). Drawing on Bourdieu, Skeggs (2004) writes how a “working-class habitus is shaped by necessity and resignation” (p. 86) where it is compelled to adapt to the dominant societal norms; she notes how if the working class are “only ever evaluated through the dominant symbolic” (p. 87), how will they ever be constituted as valued?

Studying learner identities in the classroom, Reay (2006) found that working-class children recognized those students who embodied traditional working-class behaviours as ‘good learners.’ In contrast, those who embodied ‘quiet achiever’ learner identities were overlooked and, at times, marginalized, by their peers. The impact on individual learner identities was that some
students did not view themselves as ‘clever’ though they were academically high achieving. Furthermore, other students were able to cultivate a ‘clever’ learner identity by drawing on the cultural capital afforded them by their university educated parents, as well as on their own understanding of the specific gendered and classed hierarchies of their classroom. The findings of this research speaks to how habitus, as a method of inquiry, “can be used to focus on the ways in which the socially advantaged and disadvantaged play out attitudes of cultural superiority and inferiority ingrained in their habitus in daily interactions” (Reay, 2004, p. 436).

In considering how learner identities are classed “although the habitus is a product of early childhood experience, and in particular socialization within the family, it is continually restructured by individuals’ encounters with the outside world” (Reay, 2004, p. 434). Encounters with and within educational institutions have a structuring force upon the habitus. With this in mind, other scholars have considered the capacities of working-class students to draw on certain capitals to ensure their success (Archer & Hutching, 2001). These approaches differ from their more middle-class counterparts who ‘inherit’ important knowledges from various social networks including family which set them up for success.

Keeping in mind the reconciling of the structure/agency divide, as a tool, habitus requires the researcher to focus on how the individual embodies a field (Bourdieu in Wacquant 1989) – or how dispositions are “inevitably reflective of the social context in which they were acquired” (Reay, 2004, p. 435). Not using the methodological tool of habitus may lead researchers to privilege notions of agency which ignore the wider influence of the social structure.

Concluding thoughts

To answer what habitus can offer educational researchers, this chapter has considered some of the implications for using habitus to understand learner identities. Much of educational research drawing on Bourdieu has focused on how the learner identity is structured by both the classed dispositions of those within educational fields as well as by the educational structure itself. Habitus, as a tool to think with, requires understanding people at the level of both individual dispositions and wider social structures. It seeks to provide insight into the shaping of internalized behaviours and perceptions as well as the degree of influence from social settings (e.g. family, school, leisure). We have shown how using habitus to explore learner identities brings to the fore a conceptualization of layered dispositions based on both “opportunities and constraints” as well as “external circumstances” (Reay, 2004, p. 435). Furthermore, habitus involves a consideration of how dispositions are embodied through repetitive social learning practices as well as institutional relations, though access to these are clearly not equal.

In terms of what habitus lends to our understandings of equity within unequal systems, Reay (2004) writes how, for Bourdieu, “the goal of sociological
research is to uncover the most deeply buried structures of the different social worlds that make up the social universe, as well as the ‘mechanisms’ that tend to ensure their reproduction or transformation” (p. 431). Educational research without a theory or method of habitus may foreground individual experiences/choices/actions, while not properly accounting for the dialectic of both internal and external structuring forces. In research which draws on habitus, some have called attention to “transformation” or a “transformative habitus” (c.f. McKinnon, 2016). While the habitus is significantly influenced by formal education – it can, after all, be nurtured – we would guard against notions of ‘transformation,’ as the primary habitus remains a powerful structuring force not easily altered.

It was beyond the scope of this chapter to properly discuss the scholarship which has sought to explore the relationship between the habitus of the learner identity in relation to gender and ethnicity though this remains a significant field of study (c.f. Archer & Francis, 2005; Watkins & Noble, 2013; Mu, 2014). Nor have we considered our own habitus and how it is “handled in the empirical application of habitus” through the process of writing (Li, 2015; Reay, 2004). Habitus works at the unconscious level, although it can also operate at a conscious level when individuals confront particular experiences which elicit a self-questioning (Reay, 2004). As researchers using habitus as theory at a methodological level, it is important to remain continually reflective concerning what habitus, as a ‘conceptual linchpin’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 120) brings to the forefront in one’s methodological approach.
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